Dear Commissioners:

Don't prevent states from fixing my cell phone problems. I am writing to oppose CG Docket No. 04-208 and WT Docket No. 05-194, which will unjustly take away the authority of states to tackle problems with cell phone service, including abusive cancellation penalties. Worse, the proposal will put in place a weak set of cell phone company-endorsed rules that offer no improvements in service or enforcement.

It's time to adopt policies that force cell phone companies to improve the level of service they provide to consumers. I am very up set that Cellular Phone companies only provide a simple invoice format instead of a Land Line format. How should any customer tolerate an invoice for incomming phone calls as well as not being provided with the names and numbers associated with these phone charges. I recall the American Revolution in which my family participated on behalf of the colonists; rejected taxation without representation. What type of revolution do the citizens of this great Republic need to create in order to correct this obvious stealing of customer hard earned money. If a call is not made by the receiver and this customer has no choice when using said phone devise; why should they pay for that in comming call as well as the caller. Especially if they do not see the party who made the call on the invoice nor did they make the call.

Although CG Docket No. 04-208 purports to address consumer frustration with confusing cell phone bills, hidden fees and misleading advertising, the proposal does little for consumers. In the name of helping us, the agency is proposing to block states from passing their own pro-consumer laws. As bad, WT Docket No. 05-194 would bar state courts from enforcing state law when it comes to unfair and abusive cell phone contracts. That's going too far.

States are responding to consumer complaints. Don't stop them! And don't give in to adopting weak, industry-drafted rules in their place. The FCC should stand up to the cell phone industry, and respect states rights and strong consumer protections.

Sincerely, Charles Tappan